DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 581 EA 031 138

AUTHOR	Odden, Allan; Archibald, Sarah
TITLE	A Case Study of Resource Reallocation To Reduce Class Size, Enhance Teacher Planning Time, and Strengthen Literacy: Clayton Elementary School.
INSTITUTION	Consortium for Policy Research in Education.; Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking, and Management (ED/OERI), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2000-03-00
NOTE	33p.
CONTRACT	R3086A60003
AVAILABLE FROM	Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796. Tel: 608-263-4260; Fax: 608-263-6448.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Change; *Educational Facilities Improvement; Elementary Education; Planning; *Resource Allocation; School Accounting; School Effectiveness; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

During the 1997-98 school year, the Sentry Hill School District made the decision to "redesign" Clayton Elementary School after persistently low student achievement placed the district in the lowest category of the district's accountability system. This case study outlines the changes made at the school. Redesigning the school meant removing all extant staff and hiring an all new staff during the summer of 1999. Most of the decisions about the redesign and how resources would be reallocated to fund it were made by the redesign team. A plan was developed with input from the community that had: (1) a whole-school reform model; (2) an emphasis on literacy; (3) new math and reading curricula; (4) an additional hour of instructional time 4 days a week; (5) reduced class sizes of about 15 students per classroom; (6) inclusion of special-education students in regular classrooms; (7) organizing the school into both vertical and horizontal teams; and (8) providing daily, collaborative planning time for teams of teachers. Many decisions regarding resource reallocation were made by the district. The school has made tremendous strides toward improving literacy among its students, though it is too early to say whether these efforts will result in an increase in student achievement scores. (RT)

CONSORTIUM FOR POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
University of Pennsylvania • Harvard University • Stanford University
University of Michigan • University of Wisconsin-Madison

ED 455 581

A Case Study of Resource Reallocation to Reduce Class Size, Enhance Teacher Planning Time, and Strengthen Literacy: Clayton Elementary School

Allan Odden and Sarah Archibald
Consortium for Policy Research in Education
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 W. Johnson Street
Madison, WI 53706
(608) 263-4260
http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre

March, 2000

The research reported in this article was supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management to the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) and the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison (Grant No. OERI-R3086A60003). The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Institute of Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, the Institutional partners of CPRE, or the Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Archibald
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 031 138

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Clayton Elementary School[1] is a PreK-8 school of approximately 300 students located in a large Midwestern city. The vast majority of the student population is African-American (96 percent), and the remaining four percent are Caucasian. Approximately 14 percent of all students qualify for special education services and 97 percent qualify for free or reduced-price lunch.

Clayton is located in Sentry Hill School District, which has about 50,000 students. The state in which this district is located has content and performance standards in grades 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12. The state administers proficiency tests in those grades each year, and the district administers "off-grade" proficiency tests in the other grades. The district has adopted a strong decentralized management strategy. In 1994, it partnered with New American Schools, allowing schools to select and implement a number of different comprehensive school designs. In 1996, Sentry Hill adopted a comprehensive strategic plan, which required development of a comprehensive accountability system. The accountability system now includes performance improvement targets for each school. It provides rewards for schools that meet or beat the targets, help for those that just miss, and redesigns schools that consistently fail to produce improvements. The strategic plan also encourages schools to create a team-based school structure, with each team coordinated by a lead teacher. Also, beginning in 1999-2000, Sentry Hill provided each school with a lump sum budget through a comprehensive, needs-based, school funding formula.

---

[1]The names of both the elementary school and the district in which it is located have been changed to preserve their anonymity.

UW

Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison

1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

During the 1997-98 school year, the Sentry Hill School District made the decision to "redesign" Clayton Elementary School. This meant that persistently low student achievement at the school had led the district to classify it in the lowest category of the district's accountability system. Schools placed in this category were either closed or redesigned for the first time in 1998, and Clayton was one of two schools that the district decided to redesign. Being redesigned meant a new principal, new staff, new schedule, new philosophy and new curriculum, along with many other changes. Many of these changes were made possible through the reallocation of school resources.

This case study will outline the changes that were made at the school as a result of the district redesign process. It is divided into two main sections: The Redesign Process and Paying for the Changes. Each section is then further divided into subsections that detail the various decisions made in both the redesign and resource reallocation processes.

The Redesign Process

The first section of this case study describes the process by which Clayton Elementary School underwent drastic reform. This section is divided into eight subsections: Background to the Redesign Process; Choosing the New School Design, Literacy Program and Curriculum; Implementing Inclusion; Reduced Class Sizes; Creating a Team-Based School; Creating a Schedule to Support Team Planning; Professional Development; and Accountability.

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

Background to the Redesign Process

In November of 1998, Sentry Hill School District administrators unveiled a new accountability plan to ensure that its schools were making progress toward the student achievement goals that they had set for the district. This accountability plan involved evaluating schools on the basis of improvements in student achievement and other pertinent information, on the basis of which schools were placed in one of four categories. In the first year, seven schools were placed in the lowest possible category, redesign, which meant that the superintendent had to decide whether the schools would be redesigned or closed. Clayton was one of the two schools placed in that category that the district decided to redesign.

Choosing the New School Design, Literacy Program and Curriculum

Under the Sentry Hill accountability plan, the first step in the redesign process was to remove all staff in the school. Next, an eight-member redesign committee was selected, half of whom were appointed by the district and half by the union. The role of this committee was to work with the community to select the educational strategy for the redesigned school, which, the district had already determined, would center on a particular reform model (see: www.naschools.org for examples of such models). To select the reform model, the committee examined the needs of the school's student population in order to select the design they believed would have the best chance of improving student achievement.

After considering a number of designs, the committee chose Expeditionary Learning (EL) for a number of reasons (see Stringfield, Ross & Smith, 1996 for more information about this design). First, the redesign team wanted to be sure they selected a

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

design with a proven track record for improving student achievement in other schools in the Sentry Hill School district, and EL met that criterion. Second, many of the reform model's nine design principles meshed well with the strategic goals of the district, including team-based schools, smaller class sizes, and keeping students with the same teacher until they meet promotion standards. The community members involved in the selection of the design also liked its hands-on approach to learning.

Also influencing the decision to adopt EL was the push to improve literacy at Clayton. EL recommends the use of a literacy program called First Steps, which they believe is particularly compatible with that school design. Rather than being a prescribed reading curriculum, First Steps is more of a continuing professional development program for teachers (http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/natspec/catalog/firstsetps.htm). It draws on a child's strengths, and gives teachers the knowledge they need about how students learn to read and write and what the various developmental stages are, helping teachers work with students to enable their success in literacy.

In order to support the new literacy program at Clayton, the school did three things. First, at the request of the redesign committee, they decided to eliminate the librarian position and hire a full-time literacy coordinator instead. This literacy coordinator would provide full-time, on-site support to help ensure the successful implementation of First Steps; he or she would also be responsible for monitoring student achievement in literacy. Second, the school added an hour of instructional time four days a week to ensure that there would be ample time to spend on literacy instruction. Third, the school adopted a new reading curriculum to give all teachers the materials they needed to put their new literacy program into practice. The new reading curriculum they

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

selected was Harcourt-Brace. The combination of the principles and techniques of First Steps and the materials from Harcourt Brace gives teachers a common platform from which to emphasize literacy in their classrooms.

While the focus in the first year of Clayton's redesign was literacy, the school staff also recognized the importance of a solid foundation in mathematics. For this reason, the school adopted TERC's Investigations in Number, Data and Space for grades K-5 (http://www.tercworks.terc.edu/) and Connected Mathematics Projects (CMP) for grades 6-8. Teachers then work to align all curriculum with the district's grade-to-grade promotional standards to ensure that their students are learning to the level of district and state standards.

Implementing Inclusion

Another goal of the redesign was to include all special education students who could be properly served in regular classrooms into that setting. This meant doing away with the old model of special education teachers working with students in resource rooms for up to half of the school day. At Clayton, there were 12 special education students who were classified as level 2, who could be included in regular classrooms by changing their Individual Education Plans (IEPs) to reflect the new delivery of services. One of the special education teachers who had formerly taught in a resource room had a dual licensure in special and regular education, and when the school changed to inclusion she became a regular classroom teacher. Any students who did not want to be mainstreamed had the option of going to another school.

In addition to the level 2 special education students, 15 hearing impaired students were also moved into regular classrooms. These students had formerly been taught in

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

self-contained classrooms with special education teachers. With the redesign, the students were moved to regular classrooms, and the two teachers now work with those students in the setting of their regular classrooms alongside regular classroom teachers.

One of the reasons it was possible to include both types of special-needs students in regular classrooms at Clayton in the 1999-2000 school year was another redesign initiative, reduced class sizes, described in the next section.

Reduced Class Sizes

Another important aspect of the redesign plan was to organize students into small learning groups and provide them with the maximum amount of personal attention from teachers in core academic subjects. District leaders believed that reducing class sizes to approximately 15 in these subjects was one way to boost the redesigned schools' chance of success. To accomplish this goal, many resources had to be reallocated and some new resources were also necessary. Exactly how this was done will be covered in the second section of this paper.

Teachers at Clayton report that smaller classes have many advantages. Among the advantages are the ability to give more personal attention to students, fewer discipline problems because of better classroom management, and more time spent on-task as a result. Because of these smaller classes, the kindergarten and first grade classes have been combined, which represents a first step toward the school's vision of having multiage student groups that stay with the same teacher for more than one year.

In addition, having smaller classes has enabled Clayton to schedule blocks of collaborative planning time by having more than one classroom of students attend a

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

special subject at the same time. This will be explained further in the next two subsections.

Creating a Team-Based School

Another of the district priorities for the redesigned schools was to make them team-based. These teams would then bear primary responsibility for making decisions about the school's instructional program and how resources are used. The redesign committee felt that vertical, or multi-grade teams would help create a collegial environment in which teachers could work together across grades to help students succeed. By teaming across grade levels, teams stay with the same heterogeneous group of students until they meet the promotional standards. As was previously mentioned, the school design chosen for the school, EL, is also a proponent of vertical teaming. In order to put these teams in place, the district started by hiring a principal committed to the reform model. In turn, the principal hired four team leaders to serve as the heads of the vertical teams. Next the principal and four team leaders selected the remainder of the teaching staff. The staff ended up being divided into five teams: three K-3, one 4-4-4-5-6, and one 5-6-7-8.

In addition to these vertical teams, the school also has horizontal teams, made up of teachers at the same grade level. The horizontal teams are useful for the grade-level issues that must be discussed.

Creating a Schedule to Support Team Planning

To enable these teams to work together, the next step was to create a schedule for teacher planning time that would allow teachers on the same team to meet for at least 60 minutes during the school day. Although it was challenging to create such a schedule,

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

particularly after having added the additional hour of instructional time to the school day, they were able to make it work. Table 1 illustrates both how the specialist schedule accommodates teacher planning time and how the school day is organized into its different periods.

Students are scheduled for specials on a three-day rotation between Monday and Thursday. Beginning on a Monday, each class on that team goes to music, art or physical education from 8:30-9:30 a.m., rotating to the other two classes over the next two days. See the leftmost shaded area of the chart above for an example of one of the 5-8 team's 60-minute blocks of collaborative planning time. On the fourth day, the rotation starts

Table 1
Specialist Schedule for Clayton Elementary School

Time	Specialist	Monday (Day 1)	Tuesday (Day 2)	Wednesday (Day 3)	Thursday (Day 1)	Friday
8:00-8:30	Music	Specialist planning				Grade 6/7 (8:10-9:05)
	Art					
	PE					
8:30-9:30	Music	5A/6A	7	8	5A/6A	Grade 5/8 (9:10-10:05)
	Art	7	8	5A/6A	7	
	PE	8	5A/6A	7	8	
9:35-10:35	Music	6B	4A/4B	4C/5B	6B	Grade 4 (10:10-11:05)
	Art	4A/4B	4C/5B	6B	4A/4B	
	PE	4C/5B	6B	4A/4B	4C/5B	
10:40-11:10	Music	Specialist planning				Specialist lunch (11:05-11:35)
	Art					
	PE					
11:10-11:40	Music	Specialist lunch				Grade K/1 (11:40-12:05)
	Art					
	PE					
11:40-12:40	Music	KA/1A	2C	3A	KA/1A	Grade 2/3 (12:40-1:35)
	Art	2C	3A	KA/1A	2C	
	PE	3A	KA/1A	2C	3A	
12:45-1:45	Music	1B	2A	3C	1B	Specialist Planning (1:35-2:00)
	Art	2A	3C	1B	2A	
	PE	3C	1B	2A	3C	
1:50-2:50	Music	1C	2B	3B	1C	2:00 Dismissal
	Art	2B	3B	1C	2B	
	PE	3B	1C	2B	3B	

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

over again (as indicated by the shaded area in the "Thursday" column). Part of what makes this possible at Clayton is the smaller class sizes. As you can see from the shaded areas between Monday and Thursday above, both a 5th grade and a 6th grade classroom share time with the specialist during all of these 60-minute planning periods. This is even more common in the lower grades. On Fridays the schedule is different; horizontal, or grade-level teams are scheduled for 55-minute blocks of collaborative planning time. For example, as indicated by the shaded area in the "Friday" column, the fourth grade teachers have 55 minutes of planning time together between 10:10 and 11:05 a.m. every Friday. Taken as a whole, Clayton's schedule represents a school that has managed to find time for collaborative planning periods for teachers without compromising time spent on academics.

Professional Development

In order to make all of the aforementioned changes at Clayton, teachers needed new knowledge and skills. Most were unfamiliar with both Expeditionary Learning and First Steps, so a substantial amount of professional development had to take place before the redesigned school could open its doors. Since the majority of Clayton's funding went toward hiring enough classroom teachers to have class sizes of 15, there was not a lot of money in the budget to fund the intensive professional development necessary to implement the chosen reforms. Because of this, everyone who applied to be a teacher at Clayton was informed that they would have to attend an unpaid three-week summer institute, where they would gain the knowledge and skills they needed to implement the new school design and literacy program. Despite this condition of employment, many teachers were willing to take on the tasks involved with working in the redesigned

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

school. In fact, many described those three weeks as a bonding experience for the school staff as well as being a necessary acquisition of the knowledge and skills they would need to teach under the new design.

In addition to the three-week summer institute, there are many ongoing professional development opportunities for teachers at Clayton. Some of these are offered at a district professional development academy, while other opportunities occur during the normal school day. In terms of district-wide opportunities, teachers can attend any of the classes offered at the professional development academy. These classes are free of charge, but are held during after-school hours, so teachers must volunteer their time. Still, many teachers at Clayton have chosen to take advantage of such opportunities. For example, many teachers volunteered to take a mathematics standards and practice class in order to ensure that their students were getting the best mathematics instruction possible.

Many valuable professional development opportunities are also available at the school site. Because First Steps is a method of teaching literacy rather than a prescriptive program, it emphasizes continual learning of new techniques and practical application of different methods in the classroom. To accomplish this, at least one 60-minute block of planning time for vertical teams is devoted to literacy each week. During these sessions, teachers meet with the literacy coordinator to discuss student work, discuss different methods that might be effective in teaching particular students, or learn a new technique One of the team leaders emphasized the usefulness of this kind of professional development, saying that unlike many professional development activities, this one was not focused on an abstract concept. Instead, these sessions are focused on how teachers

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

can actually develop, implement and assess a particular lesson. This practical, ongoing professional development allows teachers to continually improve their daily instructional practices.

Accountability

In order to ensure that the redesign is successful, the district put a number of accountability measures in place at Clayton. First, the school is responsible for creating a One Plan, which is its plan for improving student achievement at the school. The school is paired with a district administrator who then works with the staff to create and maintain this plan for improvement. Second, the students at Clayton must take standardized tests to ensure that student achievement is indeed improving. These tests include the state-mandated proficiency tests in the fourth and eighth grade, as well as the Off-Grade Proficiency Tests (OGPT), which are administered in the spring to students in grades two, three, five and seven. In addition, instead of the California Achievement Test (CAT), a shorter norm-referenced test known as a survey test is administered to students in the first, third, fifth and seventh grades. Third, the school is still being monitored by the same accountability system that placed them in the school redesign category to begin with. Based on student achievement data, Clayton was recently placed in the next higher category, school intervention, and the school will attempt to continue to progress into the next highest category of the school assistance and redesign plan.

Summary

These eight subsections have detailed all the changes that were made at Clayton when the school was redesigned. In the next section, we describe how resources are allocated to schools in this district, and then discuss how Clayton chose (with some

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

decisions made by the district) to use those resources to pay for all of the expensive elements of the redesign.

Paying for the Changes

Whenever reforms are adopted at the school level, changes must be made in the way school resources are spent. In this case, because the school was redesigned and a whole new staff was hired the summer before it reopened, many of the reforms were chosen by the district. Because of this, the district also made a number of the decisions about how Clayton's resources could be reallocated in order to fund all of the elements of the redesign. Still, in order to trace which resources were reallocated, it is necessary to describe how this district allocates money to schools, which is explained in the following subsection. Having done that, the next subsection details the actual decisions that were made about staffing and resources at Clayton for the 1999-2000 school year.

District Allocation Method

This subsection provides the details of the staffing and resource allocations that Clayton Elementary School receives from the district, as well as from other sources. As was mentioned previously, the method by which the school receives its allocations changed in the same year that the school was redesigned. Beginning in the 1999-2000 school year, the Sentry Hill School District created a *Students First* budget, which moves more control of funds and services to schools.

This budget model devolves a full 81 percent of the total operating budget to schools. Central office functions retained include approximately 10.3 percent for instructional and student support, 1.2 percent for district-provided professional

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

development, 6 percent for administration, and 1.2 percent for fixed expenses. The remainder is budgeted to schools through a multi-faceted funding formula. About 75 percent of the delegated schools budget is allocated on the basis of pupils. The base allocation is $3830 per pupil. There are no grade level weights; regular students in K-12 are all counted as 1.0 pupils.

There are three categories of curriculum enhancement, two for magnet and one for vocational education programs. The primary magnet funding is provided through weights of 1.13, 1.22, 1.25 and 1.43 that reflect the different costs of the magnet program adopted. A few "minor" magnet programs are funded by program, with a lump-sum amount provided for the program to each school. The vocational education weights are 1.0 for students in grades 7-8 and 2.20 for students in grades 9-12.

For special student needs, there are four categories or levels of special education weights, each representing greater need: 1.34, 1.51, 2.55 and 2.85. There are two additional formula elements focused on special student needs. One is a non-standard allocation for very high cost special education programs that exist in only selected schools. The second is the formula used for allocating federal Title I dollars for students from low-income backgrounds. The dollars per pupil figure varies by the percentage of poverty students in each school. The figures range from $600 per pupil for schools with a poverty concentration above 94 percent (as calculated by the number of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch), to $225 for schools with a poverty concentration just below 50 percent.

The formula includes three school-based allocations. The first provides one principal, one plant operator, money for extracurricular advisors, funds for overtime, and

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

2.0 secretaries for each school. The second is for custodians, which is allocated on the basis of square footage of the building. The third covers both transportation and utilities, and is allocated to the schools on the basis of historic actual expenditures.

The final element is a new formula phase-in adjustment that will function only for 1999-2000, the initial year of the students-based budgeting formula. This adjustment limits changes in school budgets to one-third of the difference between what they would have received on the basis of the 1998-99 budget formula and the new per-pupil budget formula. This phase-in will not be used in 2000-2001 or thereafter.

In sum, the student-based budgeting model is designed to distribute money to schools in seven "layers," or categories of funding. These seven layers are illustrated in Table 2, which shows the 1999-2000 Budget Allocation for Clayton Elementary School. The first layer is the per-pupil portion of the formula described above. Because of the redesign status of Clayton, all of its regular students are counted as magnet program students. This was one of the ways that the district tried to ensure the success of the redesign; administrators did not want the school reforms to falter because of a lack of funding. As a result, each regular student at Clayton (265 on Table 2) is weighted 1.13 rather than 1.0. Like all other schools in the district, its special education students are weighted according to severity of need; as Table 2 illustrates, October ADM counts at Clayton show 11 students at level 2, 1 at level 3, and 29 at level 4.

The first layer contains about 75 percent of the total budget; the other 25 percent of Clayton's budget comprises the six remaining layers. The second layer is the school-based allocation, which refers to those budget items that are given to each school regardless of size. These include one principal, one plant operator, money for

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

Table 2
1999-2000 Budget Allocation for Clayton Elementary School

		October ADM*		
1. Student-based allocation		Wts.	# of Students	Student Units
Regular Program Students				
K - 3		1.000		-
4 - 6		1.000		-
7 - 8		1.000		-
9 - 12		1.000		-
Magnet Program Students				
Level 1		1.130	265.0	299.45
Level 2		1.220		-
Level 3		1.250		-
Level 4		1.430		-
Special Education Students				
Level 1		1.340		-
Level 2		1.510	11.0	16.61
Level 3		2.550	1.0	2.55
Level 4		2.850	29.0	82.65
Vocational Education Students				
Level 1-Gr 7-8		1.000		-
Level 2-Gr 9-12		2.200		-
Total Students			306.0	401.26
Base Allocation Per Student Unit				3,830.00
Student-based Allocation Dollars				1,536,825.80
2. School-based allocation				217,776.88
3. Program-based allocations				-
4. Special Education - Non-Standard				61,535.41
5. Custodians		$26,900	2.5	86,080.00
6. Actuals				
Carryover				49,159.58
Incentives				227.00
Lost Books				8.45
Transportation:				200,464.00
Yellow	116,596.00			
Metro				
MiniBus	83,868.00			
Utilities:				52,547.00
Electric	25,485.00			
Gas	20,113.00			
Water/Sewer	6,949.00			
Telephone				4,920.00
Total Actuals				307,326.03
7. First Year Phase-in Adjustment				286,447.13
Total Estimated Revenues				**2,495,991.25**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

*Table 2 is based on the October Average Daily Membership (ADM) for the 1999-2000 school year.

extracurricular advisors, 2.0 secretaries, and funds for overtime. The aggregate amount of the school-based allocation for Clayton is $217,776.88 (line numbered 2 in Table 2).

Below, Table 3 provides an illustration of the specific allocations that comprise Clayton's school-based allocation.

Table 3
School-based Allocation for Clayton Elementary School

Budget Item	Funding
Principal	$73,700.00
Plant Operator	$39,260.00
Schedule E Extracurricular Advisors	$6,330.22
Secretary/Clerks (2)	$50,730.00
ACPSOP Overtime	$877.00
Total School-based Staff Costs	$170,897.22
Fringe Benefits @ 28%	$47,851.22
Total School-based Allocation	$218,748.44*

*This number is slightly different than the total school-based allocation in Table 3 because the calculations were made at two different times, and the numbers fluctuate slightly on the basis of small changes.

The third layer, called program-based allocations, is basically curriculum enhancement programs. These include special, small, school-based allocations for programs like ESL and minor magnets (magnet schools within a regular school). As Table 2 illustrates, Clayton did not receive any funding in this category.

The fourth layer is a source of funding for those special education students that are very costly to educate. The district believes that allocating these funds in this way is the fairest way to help schools cover the costs of educating high-needs students. For 1999-2000, Clayton received a little over $60,000 to help cover the costs of educating children with extreme special needs.

The fifth layer is for custodians, which are allocated to schools on the basis of square footage. Clayton was allocated a total of $86,080.00 to hire 2.5 FTE custodians.

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The sixth layer is a category for distributing funds to schools for various purposes on the basis of actual costs. It includes a carryover category, funding for incentives, money for lost books, and all sorts of transportation and utilities.

The final layer is a temporary one for the initial year of the students-based budgeting formula. It is an adjustment based on the schools' 98-99 budget allocation, implemented to ensure that schools neither lost nor gained too much from changing allocation processes. As it happened, Clayton was one of the schools that gained from the change in the allocation system. The school received $286,000 on top of their regular allocation as a result of this adjustment.

In addition to the more than $2.5 million allocated to the school through this new student-based allocation method, the school also receives federal compensatory education funding, or Title I. For Clayton, this totaled about $600 per Title I eligible pupil because of its high concentration of students from poverty backgrounds. Because the majority of the students who attend Clayton come from low-income families, the school is eligible to apply its Title I funds to a number of different school programs. The way Clayton decided to spend these funds is explained in the next subsection.

How Clayton Allocated Its Resources to Afford Its New Programs

The last subsection described how the Sentry Hill School District allocated funds to Clayton Elementary School during the first year of the redesign. This next subsection focuses on how those funds were used to pay for the various reforms. Clayton is in a unique position with its budget; technically, the school has control over all of the funds that are allocated to it, but because of the redesign, the district made many of the decisions about how this money was spent. Because the majority of the changes involved

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

staffing the school differently, this subsection will provide an explanation of how this school is staffed according to six staffing categories, highlighting the changes to the way it was staffed before the redesign. In addition, other expenditures necessary to implement the elements of the redesign will be detailed. For this purpose, the six categories of staffing are:

1. Classroom teachers: Teachers of the core curriculum.

2. Regular education specialists: Teachers of subjects outside the core curriculum, such as art, physical education, library and music, who also provide planning and preparation time for classroom teachers.

3. Categorical program specialists: Teachers outside the regular education classroom whose salaries are paid largely by categorical program dollars, including special education, compensatory education (Title I), bilingual/ESL and other programs for special needs students.

4. Pupil support specialists: Professional staff who provide non-academic support services to students outside the regular education classroom, such as guidance counselors, psychologists and nurses.

5. Aides: Paraprofessional staff who provide either instructional support (including working one-on-one with children both within the regular classroom and in resource rooms) or non-instructional support (including clerical tasks and supervising the cafeteria and/or playground).

6. Other Staff: Any other staff employed by the school, including clerical, cafeteria and custodial workers.

Classroom teachers

As section one described, a major part of the redesign at Clayton was the district decision to reduce class sizes to approximately 15 students per classroom. As a result of this decision, more money had to be allocated for classroom teachers. In the 1999-2000 school year, the school had a total of 300 kids, all of whom were primarily served in regular classrooms. Therefore, they needed to hire 20 classroom teachers, which is 8 more than were necessary for the class sizes of approximately 25 the previous year. To

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

get the extra money for these teachers, administrators at the district and at the school reallocated some resources and allocated additional resources for this purpose, as detailed in the following paragraphs.

First, the district decided to eliminate some positions altogether. Although most schools in the Sentry Hill District have instructional assistants to help teachers, these positions were eliminated at Clayton, freeing up enough funds so that the school could afford to hire four more classroom teachers. Second, by including the 12 level 2 special education students in the regular classrooms, the school was able to convert one special education teacher with dual licensure into a regular classroom teacher. These first two ways that the district found more money are examples of reallocating resources from within the school budget.

The district also decided to supplement Clayton's budget in a number of important ways that allowed them to hire additional classroom teachers without spending their entire budget. As explained in the subsection on the District Allocation Method, Clayton students were weighted slightly higher than most elementary students in the district because of its redesign status (1.13 as compared to 1.0). Also, because of a district decision to concentrate discretionary resources where they were needed most, the school received enough money to pay for one additional classroom teacher through the federal class-size reduction initiative that gave extra money to school districts around the country to reduce class size. In addition, the redesign at Clayton happened in the same year that the district moved to a student-based funding formula; some schools benefited from this change and others did not. Clayton was one of the "winners" as it ended up with more money as a result of the change in the allocation method.

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

Finally, the school staff decided to use some of its Title I funding to pay for additional classroom teachers. In the previous year, Title I funds were used to pay for one full-time teacher, a .5 FTE guidance counselor, and three instructional aides. In the year of the redesign, the school decided to eliminate the aide positions and fund the guidance counselor in a creative new way (described later), thereby allowing them to fund an additional classroom teacher with Title I funds. This is illustrated on Table 4.

Table 4
1999-2000 Title I allocation for Clayton Elementary School

	Amount	FTEs
TOTAL ALLOCATION	$162,750.00	
Salaries & Wages:		
Certificated Personnel Standard Allocation: Teacher – Elementary	$106,080.00*	2.0
Civil Service Personnel Instructor Assistants (I/A)		0.0
Nonpersonnel Expenses:		
Instructional Supplies	$6,820.40	
Prof./Tech. Consulting Services	$10,000.00	
Textbooks – New Consumables	$10,147.20	
Totals		
Personnel + Fringe Benefits (28.00 %)	$106,080.00 +$29,702.40 $135,782.40	
Nonpersonnel	$26,967.60	
TOTAL BUDGET	$162,750.00	

*The Sentry Hill School District instructs schools to use the average salary figure for teachers ($53,040) rather than actuals, based on the theory that this practice avoids "personnel game playing" and ensures that the best qualified teacher is in the classroom, regardless of salary.

All of the reallocations listed above enabled the school to hire seven additional classroom teachers, and the additional money from the district enabled them to purchase

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

one more to make a total of eight – exactly the number that was necessary to reduce most class sizes to 15.

Regular Education Specialists

Another important part of the redesign at Clayton was creating a team-based school. As explained in the first section, organizing the school into vertical teams created quite a challenge when it came to scheduling collaborative planning time for these teams. Adding to this challenge was the fact that Clayton added an hour of instructional time in the first year of the redesign as well. The district's goal was to give these teams 90 minutes per day of collaborative planning time. The original plan for providing this time was to use a creative method of hiring regular education specialists. Instead of hiring three full-time specialists, one for art, one for physical education and one for music, the district redesign team decided that the school should hire 10 part-time (.3 FTE) specialists. This way, the 10 specialists could be in charge of the students every afternoon, during which time classroom teachers would have 90 minutes of uninterrupted planning time. This would actually cost less than hiring three 1.0 FTEs, as the school had done the previous year, because the 10 part-time specialists would not receive benefits.

The initial plan would have worked this way. To begin, students had been scheduled for classes for six hours each day while teachers were scheduled for seven hours. But to provide the additional hour of instruction, the school first changed the student schedule to the full seven hours, 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. Unfortunately, that extra hour without students had provided 60 minutes of planning time for teachers. That time, combined with a planning period during the day, could have provided the time for the 90-minute planning block with some creative scheduling. But the school eliminated this

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

possibility because their new educational strategy required them to first extend the students' instructional time by one hour per day. This made carving out 90 minutes for planning more difficult.

With the new 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. schedule for both students and teachers, the school set aside 8 a.m. to 1 p.m. as an uninterrupted *academic* instructional block each day. Instruction in reading, mathematics, science and social studies were to be provided during these five hours. Teachers and students would then have lunch from 1:00 to 1:30 p.m. After that, all classroom teachers were to have 90 minutes of planning time from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. The most creative part of the schedule was how the school planned to provide this free time for all classroom teachers each afternoon.

The plan was to take three full-time specialist teacher positions, part of its regular budget, and convert them into 10 part-time positions at 0.3 FTE for each part-time position. The ten part-time teachers would provide all of the supervision and instruction during the afternoon time from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. In addition, because a teacher at 0.3 FTE would work only for two hours and 15 minutes per day, they would also be in charge of making sure students got on the buses between 3:00 and 3:15 p.m. each afternoon.

Of course, the overall strategy would not work if both the teachers and the students begin their day at 8 a.m., so the plan was to have teachers arrive at 7:45 a.m. instead. The school would compensate teachers for that extra time (75 minutes) by allowing them to leave at 1:45 on Friday afternoons (75 minutes "early"), while still allowing them the four 90-minute blocks of planning time Monday-Thursday.

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

The school's plan ingeniously shows how it could have been possible for a school to provide these large amounts of planning time, and also extend the student's instructional time by an hour each day – without spending additional money.

However, the school was not able to find 10 people willing to work only .3 FTE; they were only able to find one such employee. Therefore, they had to revise their original plan for providing collaborative planning time. Instead of getting 90 minutes per day of uninterrupted planning time, teachers now get 60 minutes each day. As explained in section one, this time is devoted to vertical teams four days a week, and the other day it is devoted to horizontal teams. Still, the fact that the school managed to schedule so much collaborative planning time with only three regular education specialists on staff is quite an accomplishment. Part of the reason it was possible at Clayton is the reduced class sizes; the same regular education specialist can relieve more than one classroom teacher for a planning period because class sizes are larger for "specials" subjects. Because of this, it was not necessary to reallocate resources either to or from this staffing category to implement the redesign.

The district did make an additional staffing decision that affected the regular education specialist category. During the previous school year, Clayton had employed a full-time librarian. But because one of the emphases of the redesign was literacy, the district decided that the school would be better off hiring a full-time literacy coordinator in place of the librarian, so the latter position was eliminated.

Categorical Program Specialists

Many schools that undergo significant school reform reallocate the most money within the categorical program specialist category. While this was not true for Clayton, a

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

substantial amount of reallocation of these dollars did take place. Categorical program funds can include English as a Second Language (ESL), compensatory education (mainly federal Title I funds), and special education. Because no ESL students attend Clayton, the school does not receive any ESL funding.

Table 4 shows how the school used the funding in 1999-2000, when the majority of the funding was used to pay for two teachers. In the previous year, only one teacher had been funded with Title I, but three instructional aides and a .5 FTE guidance counselor were also paid for with Title I funds. This represents a substantial reallocation of these funds, because in order to pay for that additional teacher, three Title I instructional aide positions were eliminated, and a community partnership was forged to pay the costs of the guidance counselor, as explained in the next subsection.

In terms of special education, at the beginning of 1999-2000, there were 12 students who were classified as level 2 special education, which the district felt should be moved back to regular classrooms. The year before, two dual-certified teachers had been working with these students in resource rooms. When these students were integrated into the regular classroom, one of these teaching positions was converted into a regular classroom teaching position. The other position was eliminated, but this is not necessarily an example of resource reallocation since the special education funding for the other teacher was reduced when the new inclusionary model was put in place.

In addition, there were four special education teachers at the school in 1998-1999 who worked with the population of hearing impaired students. Even though one of the goals for the school was to use an inclusionary model that would incorporate the special education students into the regular classroom, these teachers fought that idea. They felt

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

they should still be allowed to serve these hearing impaired students in a self-contained classroom. In the end, half of the hearing impaired students and half of the teachers were moved to another school. The remaining students were integrated into the regular classroom, and the two remaining teachers now work with them in their regular classrooms, pulling them out for a maximum of one class period per day.

The school also employs a part-time speech therapist (.6 FTE), who comes to the school three days per week to work with students who have speech problems. This position is also funded with special education money, but is not a new position since the redesign.

Pupil Support Specialists

With the initiative to reduce class size described earlier, the district was worried that Clayton's budget would be tight. One way the district found extra resources in Clayton's budget was by deciding that the school allocation would not be used to pay for mental and social services for students. Instead, they were able to make arrangements with two community groups who agreed to provide social services for the school. Because of this unique community partnership, Clayton has 2.4 FTE guidance counselors that they do not have to pay for with their allocation from the district.

In addition, Clayton employs a .2 FTE psychologist who comes to the school just one day per week to provide mental health services. Despite the district plan not to use the school's general fund allocation for this purpose, the school found it necessary to employ a psychologist part time. This represents a small example of the school deviating from the district plan for reallocating resources to the redesign.

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

Aides

As was noted previously, the redesign plan that prioritized class-size reduction specified that one way to pay for more classroom teachers would be to eliminate all regular education instructional aide positions. In the past, all teachers at Clayton had instructional assistants working alongside them in their classrooms. However, with class sizes of approximately 15 students, the authors of the redesign believed that these assistants would no longer be necessary. Therefore, 12 instructional aide positions were cut, allowing the school to hire four additional classroom teachers.

This represents a significant reallocation of resources, and one that could potentially create a problem for teachers. However, the fact that the staff at Clayton was all new in the year that the school was redesigned meant that the teachers who were employed at Clayton were not necessarily accustomed to having their own instructional assistants. Those that were complained that there is no one to perform some of the tasks that instructional assistants sometimes perform, but because these teachers were aware that this would be the case when they took the job, there has not been a significant backlash from the elimination of these positions.

Other Staff

When Clayton was redesigned, some changes took place in the organization of the school office. The school, which is housed in two different buildings located across the street from one another, functioned with two separate offices before the school was redesigned. Each office had one full-time clerical worker. With the redesign came an effort to better integrate the two buildings and make them feel like one school, and one of the ways this was accomplished was by having only one office. However, rather than

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

reducing the number of clerical workers in the combined office, the school decided to keep both positions in hopes of providing better support for the school principal. Therefore, although a change was made in the way the clerical staff functions, no reallocation of resources took place.

None of the other staff positions that fall into the category of "other staff," including custodial and cafeteria workers, were reallocated for the sake of the redesign either. Neither the school staff nor the authors of the redesign plan thought it necessary to reallocate resources in this category.

Other Allocations to the Redesign

With the remaining money in the budget, the school made a number of other purchases to support the redesign. These included $5000 in the category of "Professional/Technical Consulting Services" for the ongoing involvement in professional development for the EL design. The school also budgeted $2000 for Travel/Meetings since this design-based professional development sometimes requires travel.

Another $4000 was allocated for field trips and admission fees, since the EL design encourages student learning through expeditions. Also new to the budget after the redesign was a category for Team-based Supplies, with $1000 allocated to each team to ensure that they had the resources to function effectively. In addition, with the adoption of both a new math and a new reading curriculum, more money had to be allocated to textbooks and other instructional supplies than had been in the previous year.

All of these additional allocations add up to a substantial amount of money, money that Clayton Elementary School would not have had if it had not done such an

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

extensive reallocation of resources in order to afford all of the elements of the redesign. Much of the savings identified above – community-funded guidance counselors, no instructional aides in regular classrooms – along with extra funding from the district, made the redesign possible. With so many changes taking place in one year at this school, all of the allocations for support of the new program – planning time and resources for teacher teams, ongoing professional development, funding for student expeditions – were viewed as critical to the redesigned school's success.

Conclusion

With its new accountability system in place, Sentry Hill School District was committed to redesigning schools whose students consistently scored poorly on achievement tests. In 1999-2000, the first year that the redesign process was in place, the district changed its allocation method to a student-based formula that gave more control over school-level resources to the schools. Clayton Elementary School was one of two schools to operate under the new budgetary system *and* be redesigned in the same year.

Redesigning the school meant removing all extant staff, and hiring an all new staff during the summer of 1999. Because of this, most of the decisions about the redesign and how resources would be reallocated to fund it were made by the redesign team, comprised of both district administrators and union appointees. Based on the Students First Strategic Plan developed by the district, with input from the community, a redesign plan was developed that had eight defining characteristics:

1. A whole school reform model.
2. An emphasis on literacy – a new literacy program and a full-time literacy coordinator (instead of a librarian).

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

3. New math and reading curriculums.

4. An additional hour of instructional time four days per week.

5. Reduced class sizes of approximately 15 students per classroom, from the normal district class size of 25. This required 8 new classroom teacher positions.

6. Inclusion of special education students in regular classrooms to the greatest possible extent.

7. Organizing the school into both vertical and horizontal teams.

8. Providing daily, uninterrupted, collaborative planning time for teams of teachers.

In order to implement all of these changes, school resources had to be reallocated and some new resources had to be garnered. Again, many of the decisions about *which* resources had to be reallocated were effectively made by the district, but nevertheless, Clayton Elementary School represents a school where resource reallocation made major changes to the school organization possible.

The majority of the reallocated resources went toward funding the eight additional classroom teachers necessary to reduce class sizes from 25 to 15. To do this, the school eliminated all 12 regular education instructional aide positions and used the funds used to hire four additional classroom teachers. Special education funds formerly used to fund a resource room teacher were used for the fifth teacher position when the school adopted its inclusionary model. To fund the sixth teacher, Federal Title I dollars were reallocated by eliminating three additional instructional aides and creating a community partnership to fund the guidance counselor formerly paid with Title I dollars. The seventh teacher was funded with federal class-size reduction money that the district passed on to the school. Finally, the eighth teacher was hired using some of the additional funds allocated to the

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

school in the year of the redesign, including the additional weighting of its pupils (as magnet program students), and the extra money allocated to the school as a result of the change in the district allocation method.

Another reallocation to help fund the redesign was the conversion of the librarian position to a literacy coordinator position. When added to the other eight new positions described in the preceding paragraph, the school was able to fund nine new positions through dramatic resource reallocation. This reallocation of resources allowed the school to reduce class sizes from 25 to 15 and to enhance its focus on literacy.

In all of these important ways, school resources were spent differently after the redesign of Clayton Elementary School. In addition, the district invested extra dollars in the redesign to help ensure its success. While it is too early to say whether these efforts will result in an increase in student achievement scores, it can certainly be said that Clayton has made a number of steps in that direction. By focusing staffing and time resources on literacy – giving teachers the ongoing professional development and the collaborative planning time to improve literacy instruction, and hiring a full-time literacy coordinator – the school has made tremendous strides toward improving literacy among its students. Research suggests that these are exactly the kind of changes that must be made in schools to realize significant gains in student achievement (King and Newmann, 1999[2]; National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability, 1998[3]). Clayton Elementary School serves as an example of a school that, with leadership and support

---

[2] King, M. Bruce, and Fred M. Newmann. (1999). School Capacity as a Goal For Professional Development: Mapping the Terrain in Low-Income Schools. Paper prepared for the Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Wisconsin Madison.

[3] National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching. (1998). "Principles for Effective Professional Development." Available online: http://www.npeat.org/

UW

Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison

1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

from the district, has been dramatically restructured so that its resources are used in the best possible ways for boosting student achievement.

UW
Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448